

REMARKS

Interview Summary

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for granting the interview on June 3, 2005. Applicant found the interview to be very helpful. At the interview, Alan Schunemann explained the invention indicating that, as opposed to the cited art, the invention identified **users and which computers are used by the users**. This feature was already present in Claim 1. However, the Examiner suggested Applicant clarify that the system was to identify users of a plurality of computers within **an organization's** communications network. The Examiner also suggested Applicant further clarify the name discovery apparatus within the claim, and amend the "whereby" language. Applicant indicated it would submit a proposed amendment including the above changes. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment seemed favorable, but that reconsideration and/or search would be applied when the formal amendment was received.

Response to Office Action

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 5, 28, and 30 were objected to due to antecedent basis issues. These claims have been amended to correct the antecedent basis issues.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-18, 20, 22-23, 25-27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Judge et al. (U.S. Pub. 20030172167). In addition, Claims 8, 12, 19, 21, 24, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judge et al.

Claims 1, 10, and 22 are the amended independent claims. These claims are not anticipated by Judge et al. Judge et al. identifies **email addresses**, whereas the present invention identifies **users and which computers are used by the users**. This feature is supported on page 3, lines 1-5 of the original specification, and also in original Claim 1. Note that Claims 1, 10, and 22 have been amended in that, in Claim 1, the thereby clause has been replaced by a wherein

clause (e.g., “wherein identifying which of said plurality of users is using which of the plurality of computers), and in Claims 10 and 22 this wherein clause has been added. This feature is important, for example, because it automates the process of monitoring a network or trying to find out who was using what computer in an attack.

In addition, per the Examiner’s suggestion, Claims 1, 10, and 22 have been amended to point out that it describes a system for identifying users of a plurality of computers within an organization’s network. This clarification is supported on page 5, lines 5-7 of the original specification.

Finally, per the Examiner’s suggestion, the name discovery apparatus has been further defined in Claim 1 to indicate it is used for extracting Internet Protocol and electronic mail addresses. This clarification is supported in original Claims 10 and 22, and on page 14, line 22 - page 15, line 16 of the specification.

In light of the above, Claims 2-9, 11-21, and 23-30 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claims 1, 10, and 22, and are thus also allowable.

Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has now been made to the Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY U.S. LLP



Dale Lazar
Registration No. 28,872

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085

Lisa K. Norton
Registration No. 44,977